Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/593,181	HILLEBRAND ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CATHY K. WORLEY	1638
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) <u>CATHY K. WORLEY</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Roberte Makowski</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: March 1-27, 2009	Time:	
Type of Interview:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul>	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(Caller W. W. Arm)		
/Cathy K. Worley/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1638		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413B (04-03) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner and the attorney had several telephone conversations about the claims, including discussions of 112 first issues for "derivatives" and for compounds "X" and "M", and in addition regarding GenBank Accession numbers in the claims. Unfortunately, the Examiner had erroneously believed the instant case had priority to 2002 due to confusion with a related case. The Examiner left a message with the attorney on Mar. 27, 2009, indicating that in light of the priority date of March 17, 2004, it turns out that there is prior art that applies to the instant claims. The Examiner apologizes for this confusion..